

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records\*



FIRST COMMITTEE  
49th meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 2 December 1976  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 49TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland)

CONTENTS

Incendiary and other specific conventional weapons which may be the subject of prohibitions or restrictions of use for humanitarian reasons: report of the Secretary-General [35]

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference [40]

Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa [42]

Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [45]

General and complete disarmament [49]

- (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;
- (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency;
- (c) Report of the Secretary-General

Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [116]

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room LX-2332.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.1/31/PV.49  
6 December 1976

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 35, 40, 42, 45, 49 and 116 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue the consideration of the remaining agenda items relating to disarmament. As we agreed yesterday, we shall devote today's meetings to voting or action on draft resolutions, but before that I shall call on the representative of Canada.

Mr. JAY (Canada): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In agreement with the representative of Liberia, I have asked for the floor at this juncture to speak very briefly on document A/C.1/31/L.28. Attached to that draft resolution is, of course, a proposed declaration of a new philosophy on disarmament that has already caught our interest and promises to give rise to much reflection in the period ahead. Few, if any of us, in this room, will have remained unmoved by the sincerity of intention, breadth of conception and masterful presentation of this initiative. There is little question that the international and national consideration of disarmament needs to be inspired by fresh imagination and a new sense of purpose. For having reminded us of that need in this most eloquent way, our distinguished friend from Liberia has earned our gratitude. It was therefore with hesitancy that I approached Ambassador Harmon yesterday to inquire whether he would yield to the difficulties of some delegations, like my own, who would not be able to obtain instructions from our capitals, in the time left for our deliberations here. Encouraged by his sympathetic understanding, I would now ask him here to consider as an alternative to seeking a formal decision in this Committee, that he might send his proposed text under cover of a letter to the Secretary-General, so that his imaginative ideas can be circulated as a numbered document of this Assembly. I am sure that the distinguished representative of Liberia appreciates the spirit motivating this suggestion and I am confident that with his customary generosity he will understand how gratified a number of his colleagues would be if he could agree to it.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I have listened with gratification to the statements made by the representative of Canada in his sincere effort to give full recognition to the initiative and concern of the Liberian delegation in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.28 and a draft declaration of a new philosophy on disarmament, enunciating the major principles, premises and problems as a common approach by Government, international institutions and the people in the collective partnership and the development of an agenda on the reduction of armament and complete and general disarmament.

As I pointed out in my statement and draft resolution, Liberia, although a small and developing country, has a history of which we are proud, as being an older nation involved at the international level for over a century, predating many of the Member countries of the United Nations. We, as a people and a nation, experienced two world wars and our position as a nation has been consistently dedicated to peace, freedom and security of mankind everywhere. Within this context, we felt that growing out of the mounting rise of armaments in the arsenals of the world's nations, despite many efforts of the United Nations for many years to achieve some measure of progress in the reduction of armaments without any real progress being made, and motivated by the Secretary-General's report we were of the opinion that the time had come to involve the peoples of the world by making them more aware of the dangers this protracted condition poses to peace and economic progress. We felt that this initiative would involve the peoples of the world working together with Governments and world organizations, in a three-way partnership. Many delegations have approached me and complimented Liberia for taking this initiative and volunteered their support. I, too, took the liberty of discussing our submissions with many delegations, including the two super-Powers, but, as I brought out in my intervention on 30 November, unless the super-Powers are disposed to move, we could spend another 30 years debating disarmament.

(Mr. Harmon, Liberia)

The point, therefore, that I should like to make here at this time and that has been acknowledged gratefully by my colleague, Ambassador Harry Jay of Canada, is to draw the attention of the members of this Committee to the clear situation as seen from the Liberian delegation's point of view. For, regardless how great or small one may be, we together make up our one world. And the concerns of our people are equally as important as those of the greater nations.

During our national life we have witnessed two world wars, when our capital was bombarded, resulting in loss of life and property. So when we seek to intervene in debates of this high magnitude, we do so because of Liberia's consistent quest for peace and the promotion of freedom and security among all peoples everywhere. I had hoped that this draft resolution would have met with a consensus so as to give the various delegations time to consult their respective Governments in view of its importance. However, the time has come for us to make the peoples of our one world aware of their responsibility and urge their respective Governments to move forward to devise some means whereby international peace and security might be guaranteed, and we can then give attention to the economic and social plight of mankind everywhere in our world.

Finally, let me again thank my colleague, Ambassador Harry Jay of Canada, for his initiative and, in the spirit of co-operation and understanding, in view of the fact that the point has been made, and in the light of the alternative suggested, I accept the same and will ask the Chairman to take note and will undertake to forward a copy of this document to the Secretary-General to be circulated as a United Nations document.

The CHAIRMAN: I take note of the decision of the representative of Liberia and I should like to thank him for his kind co-operation in responding to the appeal made earlier by the representative of Canada.

I should like to announce at this stage that Afghanistan has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1. We shall now proceed to a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1, relating to item 40 of the agenda, "World Disarmament Conference".

(The Chairman)

Does the representative of Mexico wish to speak on a point of order relating to item 40 of the agenda, because we have already started the voting procedure on this item?

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation does not object to the Committee's voting on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1. However, I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if, in order to facilitate our work, you would be good enough to tell us now, at the beginning of the meeting, the order in which we are going to take up the dozen or so draft resolutions before us. This would help delegations to reflect on the document on which they will be called upon to take a decision. As an example of what I mean, may I merely say that, in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1, note would be taken of a decision of the General Assembly on the question of a special session devoted to disarmament, a matter dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2, which we have not yet adopted. Consequently, it might be better to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 first and then to turn to document A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1. I am not insisting on this; but I would ask you to be good enough to tell us the order in which the drafts are to be put to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a valid question. The only problem is that first, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 is concerned --- which I indeed intended to put to the vote first --- the details of the financial implications are not yet ready. The Secretariat has informed me that they will be ready by early this afternoon, so we can take action on that particular draft resolution in the afternoon.

Yesterday we decided to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20 until this morning and I was going to take it up after document A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1. I was requested by a number of delegations not to put it to a vote or for a decision as the first one, as the consultations are still in progress and are expected to be finished within a few minutes. So, in order not to waste time, I suggest putting to a decision of the Committee the draft resolution that I just mentioned if the Committee agrees. My intention is this: to put before the Committee draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1 and draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.9,

(The Chairman)

about which I am going to say a few words to the Committee in a moment, and then draft resolutions A/C.1/31/L.20 and A/C.1/31/L.25. As far as the other drafts are concerned, various delegations have approached me to say either that they are awaiting instructions, which they hope to get any moment now, or that consultations are still in progress, and I hope to be able to inform the Committee of the order in which we shall vote or take action on the remaining drafts either at the later stage of our morning meetings or at the beginning of our afternoon meetings.

I really regret this delay very much, as I have warned the Committee on more than one occasion that delegations should be ready to take action and to indicate their positions on all remaining draft resolutions today. But, the situation being as it is, I should not like to put any delegation in a difficult situation in the sense that it would not be able to vote due to the lack of instructions. As far as possible, but only as far as possible, I propose to accommodate the delegations. So, if the Committee agrees, we can continue now and, if the representative of Mexico is satisfied with the clarification that I have just given him, we shall proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1. I realize of course that it makes reference to draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2, but it seems that the sponsors of that draft resolution expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus, and I have reason to believe that it will be. I do not think that the fact that we shall take action on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2 should delay action on the draft resolution that I have just suggested the Committee should take action on. We shall then proceed with the draft resolutions relating to item 40, "World Disarmament Conference".

(The Chairman)

A wish has been expressed by the sponsors that draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1 should be adopted by consensus. I should also like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the financial implications of that draft resolution are given in document A/C.1/31/L.39. May I take it that the Committee agrees to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1 relating to item 40 by consensus? As I hear no objections, it is so decided.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: As far as draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.9 is concerned, relating to the same item of the agenda, namely, "World Disarmament Conference", I have been informed by the sponsors that in view of the appeal made yesterday by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.29/Rev.1, which we have just adopted and which commands the unanimous support of the Committee, they will not press for a vote or action on that draft resolution, A/C.1/31/L.9, as the other draft satisfies their point of view. I should like to express my thanks to the sponsors of this draft resolution for their kind co-operation.

There are no delegations that wish to explain their position after the decision of the Committee on this particular item of the agenda. I therefore declare that our consideration of the agenda is concluded.

We shall now proceed to a vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/31/L.20 relating to item 49 of the agenda, "General and complete disarmament", and dealing specifically with the question of international transfer of conventional arms. As representatives are aware, an amendment proposed by Pakistan (A/C.1/31/L.36) has also been submitted. The administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution are given in document A/C.1/31/L.35. Before we proceed to a vote I call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): Before we vote I should like, on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20, to make the following announcement. The sponsors have studied the amendment proposed by the representative of Pakistan (A/C.1/31/L.36) very carefully and we had a very friendly exchange of views with the representative of Pakistan on this amendment. We very much appreciate the understanding shown by the representative of Pakistan, and we have come to an agreement to change the text of A/C.1/31/L.20 as follows.

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

The first change is in the second preambular paragraph which will read as follows. In the first line of the second preambular paragraph, after the words "for the acquisition of arms by States", the words "for the maintenance of security and" should be added. The second preambular paragraph will therefore read as follows:

"Recognizing the necessity for the acquisition of arms by States for the maintenance of security and in exercise of their inherent right of self-defence as recognized in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter."

The second change is in operative paragraph 3. In the second line after the words "governmental experts, to make" insert a comma and add "as an initial step,". Operative paragraph 3 will then read as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General with the assistance of qualified governmental experts to make, as an initial step, a factual study of the international transfer of conventional arms and submit it to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session."

The third amendment is in operative paragraph 4. In the second line add after the words "an item entitled 'Question of the ...'" the words "production and". Paragraph 4 will then read:

"Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-second session an item entitled "Question of the production and international transfer of conventional arms."

(Mr. Ogiso, Japan)

I should like to be permitted to add some explanation to those changes. I think that the first change in paragraph 2 of the preambular paragraph will not need any explanation; I think it is self-explanatory. As to the second revision, as I had explained in my introductory statement in connexion with A/C.1/31/L.20, the Secretary-General is requested to make a factual study and the result of that study will be considered at the next session of the General Assembly, but what steps should be taken as a result of the consideration at the next General Assembly or in future sessions, will be entirely open and will not prejudice the position to be taken by any delegation. So in order to make it clear that that is the initial step, we have added the words: "to make as an initial step". The last change, to add the word "production" in paragraph 4, is the result of a consideration of the proposal -- the proposed amendment -- submitted by the representative of Pakistan, and as I said in my introductory statement, although the views of Member States are requested on the question of international transfer at this meeting, and the Secretary-General is requested to make a factual study of the international transfer of conventional arms, this is not intended to prejudice the outcome of these studies and the views to be communicated by Member States, and it is not my intention to exclude from the discussion to take place in the next session, the phases of production of conventional arms, in case the views along that line are submitted by the Member States, in accordance with operative paragraph 1. That is the short explanation which I wished to make in connexion with the amendment which I have just introduced, and with that revision I hope that the representative of Pakistan will not press his amendment to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has taken note of the oral amendment he has just submitted to preambular paragraph 2 and operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): Pakistan shares the concern which has been expressed in this Committee about the proliferation of conventional arms, increasing destructive capacity all over the world. We are prepared to examine this question, both in a regional as well as in more general context. Such an examination, however, has to be objective in nature. It must take into account all factors

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

which contribute to the proliferation of conventional arms and devise equitable and realistic measures to check this phenomenon. In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20, introduced by the representative of Japan, lacked balance, in so far as its primary objective appears to be to focus attention only on the acquisition of conventional arms by the developing countries of the third world. It must be remembered that the major proportion of the world's expenditure on conventional armaments is still incurred by a handful of industrialized States and other large countries. By comparison, the expenditure of most small and medium-sized States on armaments is a minimal part of global military expenditure.

It is therefore necessary to examine, not only the transfer in arms, but also the trade in arms, including indigenous production of arms by various countries, a restraint on the export or transfer of arms alone would do nothing to prevent those States which are capable of producing conventional weapons from expanding their armaments and developing their weapons. On the other hand, we feel that an estoppel on the transfer of arms would gravely endanger the security of the smaller and weaker States which by and large do not have the capacity to produce arms indigenously for their security against external threat. It was for these considerations that my delegation had put forward the amendments in document A/C.1/31/L.36 to the draft resolution. In our view we should address ourselves not merely to the question of international transfer of conventional arms but to the broader question of production as well as the international transfer of such arms. We have had consultations with the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20. We are gratified by the changes they have introduced in the draft resolution. These do not, however, fully meet our point of view. None the less, in a spirit of understanding my delegation will not press the amendments in A/C.1/31/L.36 to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I have noted that the representative of Pakistan will not press for a vote on these amendments contained in document A/C.1/31/L.36. I should like to thank him for his co-operation. Does the representative of India wish to speak on a point of order?

Mr. MISHRA (India): Under rule 116 of the rules of procedure I move that we adjourn the debate on this question. My delegation is joined in this by the delegations of Algeria, Egypt, Mexico, Nigeria and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: May I recall to the representatives that rule 116 reads as follows:

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The Chairman may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

Does the representative of Brazil wish to speak under this provision?

Mr. BUENO (Brazil): Only to support the motion just put forward.

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Japan wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): I should just like to speak on a point of order. I understand you have announced the voting procedure has already been started and the delegate of India proposed to postpone the discussion of this item. I am wondering whether you ruled that his proposal is in order under rule 116. Before asking for the floor on the substance of his proposal, I should like to have the clarification of that point.

The CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact we have not yet started the procedure of voting under rule 118. We have not yet started the voting procedure.

Mr. BUENO (Brazil): I have asked the floor to support the motion just put forward by the representative of India. My delegation is also in favour of adjourning the debate and the consideration of the item now before us.

Mr. ITOUA (Congo) (interpretation from French): I take the floor just to say that I support the motion just put forward by the distinguished representative of India regarding the adjournment of the vote on the draft resolution before us. My delegation feels that, despite the explanations provided by the representative of Pakistan, this text is affected by a grave imbalance, in that it does not at all take into account the concerns of the Africans regarding liberation movements. Consequently, I fully support the motion for adjournment proposed by the representative of India.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind the Committee that under rule 116 two delegations in addition to the proposer of the motion spoke in favour of adjournment. Now only two more can speak against; no more delegations may speak in favour. I call on the representative of Singapore. I understand that he wishes to speak against the motion.

Mr. TAN (Singapore): You are very correct, Mr. Chairman. The group of co-sponsors of this draft resolution has worked very long and very hard to come up with a compromise draft to meet the requirements of as many countries as possible, the latest being that of Pakistan which we believe has led to improvements in the draft to allay the fears and to meet the requirements of most countries. It is a shame that so much effort, so much genuine concern over this problem should be put aside and subjected to postponement. We question whether it is proper and worth while to postpone discussion of this issue till the future. What purpose would it serve other than to put aside and delay consideration of this important subject? Again, we also question the motivation of the co-sponsors of this motion to postpone the resolution. We have our reservations as to whether they are genuinely concerned for the subject or whether they are doing this because of their own ulterior motives. They allege that there are other points behind the resolution and I repeat again that there is none. The motion remains as it is and the future of the resolution lies in the hands of the majority of the Members here, that is, the third world developing countries. It would only serve their interests. It cannot be changed to be against what they are for. I therefore call on the smaller developing non-aligned countries to vote against this motion for postponement in support of their own basic interests.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Liberia. I understand that he wishes to speak under rule 116.

Mr. HARMON (Liberia): I have only asked for the floor briefly to support what my colleague and the co-sponsors of this resolution have already said, and against the attempt to delay action on important issues. As he said, we spent quite some time on this matter yesterday and this morning and we have had several meetings together with various delegations, and I strongly urge that we vote against the motion of my colleague from India.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now heard a proposal made by the representative of India under rule 116 to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion. It was supported by two representatives and opposed by two representatives. According

(The Chairman)

to the rule of procedure just quoted, we shall have to proceed to a vote immediately on that motion.

I call on the representative of New Zealand on a point of order.

Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand): I should like to ask you please to clarify the exact motion on which we are voting. Are we voting to put off discussion on item 49, which is the item we are discussing, that is, general and complete disarmament?

The CHAIRMAN: The representative of India, if I heard him correctly, moved for the adjournment of debate on the question of international transfer of conventional arms, which is one of the questions submitted under general item 49, general and complete disarmament. That was my understanding and I think that the representative of India may clarify this, if that is necessary. I call on the representative of India, but that was my understanding.

Mr. MISHRA (India): That was my proposal, and while I have the floor may I ask for a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall then proceed to a recorded vote on the motion to adjourn the debate on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20, as orally amended by the representative of Japan.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour      Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda,

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Liberia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Austria, Bangladesh, Burma, Chad, Costa Rica, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Romania, Sweden, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Zaire, Zambia.

The motion was adopted by 51 votes to 32, with 33 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the result of the vote just taken, we accordingly adjourn the debate on the question dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.20, entitled "Question of international transfer of conventional arms".

We shall now proceed to a decision on the next draft resolution under the same item, namely, item 49, "General and complete disarmament", draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25, which was introduced by Mexico on 30 November of this year. I have been informed that the resolution carries no financial implications.

I shall now call on delegations that wish to explain its vote before the voting.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25, the Soviet delegation would like to state the following. The Soviet Union attaches crucial importance to the successful solution of the problem of limiting strategic nuclear weapons and of their reduction. The conclusion in recent years between the Soviet Union and the United States of agreements for the prevention of nuclear war and the limitation of strategic weapons and their testing are of crucial importance as a means of reducing the threat of nuclear war and curtailing the arms race. We appreciate the fact that steps have already been taken in the area of preventing nuclear war. However, the Soviet Union is ready to go even further and to step up efforts to conclude a new agreement with the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons on the basis of the well-known Vladivostok Agreement, which oriented both States towards a limitation of these weapons not only quantitatively but also qualitatively, as well as towards their further limitation. The readiness to step up these efforts was once more reaffirmed in the statement made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Brezhnev, just a few days ago. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction the great interest manifested by delegations of many countries to the General Assembly regarding the Soviet-United States strategic arms limitation talks. Of course, no less than these countries we would like to see these talks successfully completed in the near future. However, in our view, draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25 gives a distorted picture of the results of the talks between the USSR and the United States on the

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

limitation of strategic weapons. In it an illegal attempt is made to prejudge the order, concrete orientation and possible results of these talks, which represents interference in the conduct of these talks. For these reasons, the Soviet delegation will vote against this draft resolution.

Mr. BLACK (United States of America): As we have stated in the past, the United States welcomes the interest shown by the international community in the strategic arms limitation talks. My Government has worked seriously to contribute to the achievement of a SALT II agreement at the earliest possible date. We will vote against the draft resolution now being considered by the Committee because of our strong objections to the language of its first and second operative paragraphs. We believe these paragraphs seriously misrepresent the facts in ways which my delegation identified last year in explaining our negative vote on a similar resolution.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): We will vote in favour of the resolution but I want to refer to the statement made last year on this question with our strong reservations.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/31/L.25) was adopted by 94 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany on a point of order.

Mr. SCHLEICH (Federal Republic of Germany): My voting button did not work, so I want to underline the fact that had it worked, the Federal Republic of Germany would have been shown as abstaining on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: The abstention of the Federal Republic of Germany will be duly recorded. This is the second case of mechanical fault and I request the Secretariat to do what is necessary to avoid such occurrences in the future.

I shall now call on those delegations which wish to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. JAY (Canada): Although the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks are bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, they are of vital interest to the international community as a whole. They are of crucial importance in helping to further a climate of strategic stability and détente. By pledging themselves to pursue these negotiations, the leaders of these two Powers have recognized their responsibilities to the international community. However, as valuable as they have been, the SALT talks have not produced the results that we all had hoped for by this time. They have not yet achieved steps of actual nuclear disarmament. My delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25 in order to join with others in this Committee in stressing once again the urgency we attach to early agreements between the United States and the USSR on further qualitative limitations and substantial reductions of their strategic nuclear weapons systems. We must bear in mind, however, that arms limitation is a highly complex endeavour. Arms control and disarmament measures cannot be effective unless they take full account of the security concerned of the State they affect, of the latest political conditions, of the complexities of steadily advancing military technology and of the need of States to be adequately assured that the agreements they enter into will be fully implemented by all parties.

Despite our affirmative vote on the resolution, my delegation must register its serious reservations, as we did last year in voting for resolution 3484 regarding the accuracy of some of the language of operative paragraphs 1 and 2. While we regret that it is not impossible to conclude a second SALT agreement as

(Mr. Jay, Canada)

early as we had hoped, Canada recognizes the importance of the principles agreed by the United States and the USSR at Vladivostok in November 1974. We would have wished that this achievement had been reflected in operative paragraph 1 and we regret the failure of operative paragraph 2 to take account of the guidelines established at Vladivostok aimed at limiting multiple warheads delivery vehicles. For these reasons, we would have abstained on operative paragraphs 1 and 2 if they had been separately put to a vote. Although my delegation would have preferred different language from that in the resolution before us, we believe that its general objective is to express the recognition by this Committee of the very great importance of these negotiations and the common desire of the international community to see progress made in the negotiations being pursued by the United States and the USSR.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The delegation of Finland has just voted for draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25, although with certain misgivings. In our previous statements we have made clear the importance which the Finnish Government attaches to the SALT negotiations both in political terms and as an arms control measure in the field of nuclear armaments. We consider these negotiations as a contribution to détente, to a more balanced strategic environment and therefore an important structure for peace. Against this background the present draft resolution seems to us to give too negative an assessment of the results achieved so far in the SALT negotiations, or indeed of the results yet to be expected. We have voted for the resolution as a reflection of the desire of this Assembly to see further and more rapid progress in these negotiations, a desire which we believe the parties involved in those negotiations fully share.

Mr. SCHØN (Denmark): As was the case during last year's General Assembly in respect to resolution 3434 C (XXX), Denmark has voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. We explained last year, and I would like to repeat this year that, in view of the highly complex subject-matter under negotiation in the SALT II, we have strong reservations as to the content of this resolution. If operative paragraphs 1 and 2 had been put up for a separate vote, my delegation would therefore have abstained. The main thrust of the text, however, is one with which my Government can fully associate itself and that is why my delegation has voted in favour of it.

Mr. KAPLLANI (Albania): For reasons my delegation explained, amply clear in the debate which took place before this Committee, we did not participate in the vote of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25. The People's Republic of Albania looks upon the SALT talks and SALT agreement as an attempt by the two super-Powers to cover up their armaments race and to deceive world public opinion about the so-called disarmament effort they are exerting. For these reasons we did not participate in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to state that we voted in favour of the resolution we have just adopted with complete awareness of what we were doing and we did so in the certainty that the two super-Powers mentioned in the text would perhaps take this resolution as an encouragement and that therefore they should be grateful to the international community that is showing trust in them and reliance on their efforts to come to a final agreement on the limitation of strategic weapons.

(Mr. Rios, Panama)

If it be true that they intend -- and there are reasons to have certain doubts regarding this matter, since much has been said about it for a long time with no truly positive results being achieved -- if, as I say, they do intend to come to some agreement on the limitation of the strategic weapons, then the reason for which I have asked to speak is borne out, namely, to urge them and to invite them to continue with their work, and to point out to them that the international community has watched with a certain scepticism and some discouragement at the undue prolongation and continuation of these talks, without any tangible or positive results.

However, I believe that the problem of nuclear weapons has reached such grave and dangerous proportions that the United Nations will, in the future, not merely have to be satisfied with adopting resolutions of this nature, but as the international community, the United Nations will have to adopt more drastic and draconian resolutions to force the producers and the manufacturers of nuclear weapons to put a final end to the manufacture of and the threat inherent in the use of nuclear weapons.

It is the international community that is running the risks, and it is from this standpoint that we must study the matter. This is not a matter falling solely within the competence and the concern of the great Powers, who daily manufacture more perfect and more murderous weapons. The entire international community is concerned, it is the entire international community that is in danger and, therefore, my delegation would like to make a dramatic appeal to the great Powers. We, the majority, we the third world, urge the great Powers to get down to serious work so that this matter of general and complete disarmament cease being mere rhetoric and mere words and become a truly positive and tangible reality.

Mr. OXLEY (Australia): My delegation recognized that the resolution we have just adopted was unbalanced in that it did not recognize the complexity of the strategic arms limitation process. The progress made to date and the contribution which the negotiations themselves can make to greater stability in the United States-Soviet bilateral relationship has an important bearing on international stability. However, because of Australia's deep concern about

(Mr. Oxley, Australia)

the importance to international security and the need for the super-Powers to agree to place significant limitations on their strategic arms, Australia supported resolution A/C.1/31/L.25.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no more delegations wishing to explain their votes. Thus we have concluded the consideration of the question referred to in draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.25 which we have just adopted.

I should like to inform the Committee that Senegal has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.31.

The situation now is as follows: we still have a number of draft resolutions on which we must take action, but a number of delegations have asked me to postpone the vote on most of these resolutions until this afternoon because they are awaiting instructions. We could be ready to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7/Rev.2, relating to the special session of the General Assembly, but in this case we are waiting for the financial implications which, as the Secretariat informs , will be ready early this afternoon.

In the circumstances, I propose to adjourn the meeting until 3 p.m. this afternoon when we shall take up the draft resolutions in the order in which they have been presented, starting with draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.7.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.